

### Remarks

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-12 and 18-34. Claims 18 and 27 have been amended. Claims 29-34 have been canceled. The Examiner has allowed Claims 1-5 and 13-17.

Claims 6, 8, 18, 20 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as anticipated by US 7,269,182 to Carrel et al. Carrel et al shows an arrangement where host 101 requests a PPPoE session from access concentrator 111. Access concentrator 111 then provides a PPPoE session. Host101 listens for traffic, and receives PPPoE data. Nowhere is there any participation by other hosts until they request a PPPoE session. Even if host 101 is considered to be a dedicated terminal, nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest establishing a unicast session between an intermediate device and a dedicated terminal, and monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and a dedicated terminal, by user devices. Nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest:

‘monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices’,

as specifically set forth in Claim 6. Rather, in Carrel et al, host101 transmits a PPPoE discovery request to access concentrator 111. Host 101 listens for traffic on the IP multicast channel. Host 101 then receives the requested PPPoE encapsulated multicast packet. See column 1, lines 51-57 of Carrel et al. Note that only the requesting device monitors transmissions of multicast data packets. Nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest that user devices monitor transmissions of multicast data packets between an intermediate device and a dedicated terminal. It is therefore clear that Carrel et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 6.

Similarly, nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest:

“means for monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 18. Rather, in Carrel et al, host101 transmits a PPPoE discovery request to access concentrator 111. Host 101 listens for traffic on the IP multicast channel. Host 101 then receives the requested PPPoE encapsulated multicast packet. See column 1, lines 51-57 of Carrel et al. Note that only the requesting device monitors transmissions of multicast data packets. Nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest that user devices monitor transmissions of multicast data packets between an intermediate device and a dedicated terminal. It is therefore clear that Carrel et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 18.

Similarly, nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest:

“establishing a unicast session with a dedicated terminal;  
one of said user devices monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 27 as amended. Rather, in Carrel et al, only the requesting terminal monitors transmissions, as discussed above. It is therefore clear that Carrel et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 27.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35USC103(a) as unpatentable over Carrel et al in view of US 2002/0143591 Kahn et al and US 2002/0141394 to Hardisty. Carrel et al has been discussed above. Kahn et al relates to a system for sending multicast information to unicast clients, using agents. Nowhere does Kahn et al show or suggest:

“monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets to determine whether said identified multicast data packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 25.

Hardisty relates to a system for managing Internet protocol of unicast and multicast communications. Nowhere does Hardisty show or suggest:

“monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets to determine whether said identified multicast data packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 25. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 25 is not affected by Carrel et al, Kahn et al and Hardisty, taken either singly or in combination.

US 2003/0053434 to Chow et al has been cited only against dependent Claims 9 and 21. Chow et al relates to push-to-talk service in a WLAN. Nowhere does Chow et al show or suggest any monitoring to determine if multicast packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session. It is therefore clear that Chow et al is no more pertinent to the independent claims than the references which have been applied by the Examiner.

Claims 7-12 are dependent from Claim 6 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 6.

Claims 19-24 are dependent from Claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

Claim 26 is dependent from Claim 25 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 25.

Claim 28 is dependent from Claim 27 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 27.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-5 and 13-17 are allowed. The Applicants submit that Claims 6-12 and 18-28 are also allowable.

Customer No. 24498  
Serial No. 10/572,818  
Resp. to OA dated 9 March 2010

PATENT  
PU030279

The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.  
A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Guillaume Bichot et al

by /Daniel E. Sragow/  
Daniel E. Sragow, attorney  
Reg. No. 22,856

Thomson Licensing LLC  
Patent Operations  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
Date: 17 June 2010